



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,488	02/26/2004	Puneet Gupta	YOR920040091US1	4982
33233	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES W. PETERSON, JR. 11703 BOWMAN GREEN DRIVE SUITE 100 RESTON, VA 20190			HA, NATHAN W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/787,488

Applicant(s)

GUPTA ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan W. Ha

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 7, 11 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 6 and 8-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 29 recites, "logic blocks are CMOS logic circuits, each comprising one or more field effect transistor, FETs." The limitation "each comprising one or more field effect transistors appears to be redundant and inaccurate since a CMOS circuit must be composed of only one n-MOS and only one p-MOS. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 29 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this case, claim 29, for example, recites limitations of the first type cell and the second type cell. However, the type of the cells is unclear since it does not specifically describe or specify a certain type of the preferred cells in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2814

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 29, 5, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lenosky (US 2004/0208266, newly cited) in view of Kono et al. (US 2002/0030510, newly cited, hereinafter, Kono.)

In regard to claims 29 and 7, and in accordance with the 112 rejection above, in fig. 2, for example, Lenosky discloses an IC circuit including at least one combination logic path comprising a plurality of logic blocks 202-208, at least one of the logic blocks being a first type cell, A/D logic, and at least one other of the blocks being a second type cell, D/A logic. Lenosky, however, does not expressly described the logic blocks in detail, or how they were formed. It should be noted that most logic blocks, for example, latches, flip-flops are designed by a combination of CMOS devices since CMOS is a fundamental element in any integrated circuit. A CMOS circuit provides delay and inverted outputs.

Kono, in figs. 1-10, discloses an analogous IC device including cells and logic blocks, the logic blocks further are formed by CMOS devices. See Kono's claim 17, for example.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to recognize the obviousness of using CMOS devices to construct an integrated circuit as taught by Kono in order to take the advantages as mentioned above.

The above combination of Lenosky and Kono does not explicitly teach that the fabrication process of the cells (claims 29 and 7.) However, the limitation "fabrication parameter having affect on the types of the cells" in claim 29 is taken to be a product by process limitation, it is the patentability of the claimed product and not of recited process steps which must be established. Therefore, when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be identical with or only slightly different than the product claimed in a product-by process claim, a rejection based on sections 102 or 103 is fair. A product by process claim directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See In re Fessman, 180 USPQ 324,326(CCPA 1974); In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289,292 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and particularly In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985), all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final structure of the product "gleaned" from the process steps, which must be determined in a "product by process " claim, and not the patentability of the process. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claim in "product by process" claim or not.

In regard to claim 5, Kono further discloses the cells or transistors are densely formed, fig. 5.

In regard to claim 11, the IC shown in Lenosky is a standard IC.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 12-28 are allowed.

7. Claims 4, 6, 8-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29, 5, 7, and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan W. Ha whose telephone number is (571) 272-1707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:00-7:00(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/787,488

Page 6

Art Unit: 2814

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nathan Ha". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Nathan Ha
November 19, 2005